[Preserve]

G. R. S. IX

Date removed

Le 40-81

192

( 42 )

Date returned

LR 69-87

LR [illegible]

LR [illegible]

LR 1313-100 (4-9)

[illegible]

Preco of Cumarcee correc
of revenue due to Govern
Straeh, Shandy, Sayer a
for the Kaycunjutta Villa
Taluk of the Kolar Distric

Report-No. 397 dated
2nd October 1885.

The Amildar of Siddla-
ghutta submitted to the
Deputy Commissioner a
balance sheet for Rs. 2559---8
due on account of Sayer
from the Inhabitants Row
on the Kaycunjutta
Village, suggesting that
the only means of recovering
the amount was to ipse
cercive processes.

† Endorst-No. 817 dated
19th January 1886.

2. Upon this the Deputy
Commr requested the Amil
dar to inform him of the
steps taken in pursuance
the Dewani Proceeding
No. 3352-3/161 of the 8th August
82, as a heavy sum on
account of Sayer
reha

reported to be on to Landing
in the Siddaghatta Tank.

3. In reply the Asst Supt
referred the Dy Comm^r to
his previous Communication
No 61 dated 18th September 1885
to Collect Rs: 311-9-2 on
account of Ryotwary and other
items and requested the
transmission of a state-
ment distributing the
amount, if feasible, over
the 12 Villages.

4. As per orders of the Dy
Comm^r the Amil forwarded
the list above alluded to and
reported that the marginally
noted sum was charged
for the 4 items Sayer &c.
In regard to the distribution
of that amount over the 12
Villages, he added, that it was
inferable from the Dewani
Sec: and also the original
Summud granted for these
12 Villages that items 1 and 2
were to be debited to Kalroo
Village and the amount
of Nos 3 and 4 to all the
Villages

† (Not in the file)

† No 465 dated 19-3-86

† No 663 dated 25-3-86.

† No 611 dated 24-10-86.

† 1. Sayer = 131-3-3
2. Shandy = 36-5-10
3. Arrack = 131-3-3
4. Forest = 12-12-10
Total 311-9-2

Dec. 671 dated 18th November 1886 to the Amil.

5. The Dy. Comm.r observed that mention was made of the two Villages Thovanur-Kumbalahully and Krish-nunnanahully in the Nirroopu of His Highness the Maharaja and these two Villages were left out in the list of division; and consequently required ex-planation from the Amil for the omission of the said Villages and also the small discrepancies in the Calcu-lations made in reducing Paivu to money.

Dec. 673 dated 18-11-86.

6. The Amildar replied that from the enquiries he made he learnt that the said two Villages were held by the said Mahudeva Rao on Kayemgutta tenure, that they were not within the limits of his taluk and that on the Other hand Thovanakumbalahully be-longed to Hidur Taluk, whi the Other to Chintamani. He further added th

the Copy of the Devanoo Roo: filed with the papers, the above two Villages had been omitted and mention was made of the 12 Villages only; and hence the omission of those two Villages in the list of division. With respect to the discrepancies in the calculations, he admitted that Berin was entered in the distribution list in accordance with the entries made in the Kayem-gutta Register (C form) received from the Devanhully taluk for the months ending 30th September 1878.

7. In reply to Dy. Commrs. Docket which is not in the file, the Inam Superintendent intimated that the reference in his office bearing on the subject showed that out of the 14 Villages, Halnoor etc 12 belonged to Devanhully taluk and

Dy. Commrs. No. 698/354 dated 7th Decr.

Inam No. 401 dated 14-12-

Thoranakumbadehully and Krishnammanahully to Kolar. In the Proceedings referred to by the Dy Comm^r, discussion he added that as ~~[illegible]~~ was made only of the Village Kaluvar, it was manifest that the Villages of the Devanhally taluk, of which Kaluvar is one, were noticed and in pursuance of the Firman granted by H.H. the Maharaja, he was also of the opinion, that the sum should be distributed proportionately over the 14 Villages.

8. The Dy-Comm^r obtained from the Amildar a revised Statement dividing proportionately over the 14 Villages the amount of Sayer, Farlot ~~fee~~ and for- warded the same to the Asst Superintendent

"of Sayer, Arrack and others 2 items.

± 867 dated 9-2-87

only. At foot of this 2nd notice also he made the same Remarks as before on the first and added that when the Village was sold in November 1898 for arrears of revenue, the items viz Sayer, Arrack, Shandy and Forest, for which Rs: 2896-14-11 ~~are~~ were demanded, were not included in the sale, that only bare Village was put to auction, that these items were reserved to Government and worked through Govt agency, that he never enjoyed the same and that the yield thereof was credited to Government without any reference to him.

12. A third notice was served on him for Rs: 239-15-10 previous years' arrears + 1157-10-6, total Rs: 1447-6-4. At foot of this notice he wrote that he was not bound to

revenue for the two years
Dhaloo and Eswara and
in such Govt sale he
purchased the Village and
that he was not liable for
payment of arrears for
Dhaloo and Eswara — the
years preceding the year
in which he purchased
the Village; also that he
had paid up the fixed rent
+ Local cess upto Sarvadhari
from the year of his pur-
-chase.

11. A second notice was
served on said Appajiah
on 12-11-89 calling upon
him to pay up the amount
due on account by Forest
and other items and
he was likewise informed
that this sum remain-
-standing for a long
time, as the matter was
in discussion and that
it had been finally settled
that it should be collected
from the Kayemgutti
only

9. The Inam Superintendent effected the distribution of the amount of Sayer and other items over the 14 Villages in accordance with the Statement and intimated the fact to the Dy. Comm^r; and the Dy. Commissioner communicated this to the Amildar.

10. The Amildar of Kolar issued a notice dated 14-10-89 to one Appajiah, the present Hayavagu Headman of the Kalvoor Village, demanding of him a sum of Rs. 2896-14-11 outstanding so far back from the year Dhatu upto Sarvadhari (14 ~~arrears~~ years' arrears). At first of this notice the said Appajiah declared that the Village Kalvoor was sold in Bahoodanya in satisfaction of arrears of revenue

+ Rs. 45

+ Rc. 45 of the 16th April 1889

to pay Rs: 289-15-10
alleged to be previous years
arrears. This sum was
due from Inamdar Ma
-hadeva Row on account
of quit-rent. Shanbogue
Puttiah who has kept
the accounts can explain
this item better. Mahade
-va Rowji Inamdar
had been attached on
account of this item of
arrears and the Dy. Comm.
had decided to obtain
orders for the sale of the
same and that nothing
was done on it.

13. The Village Kulum
had been attached and
advertised for sale on
the 29th April last.

14. Subsequent to this
-vertisement, said Appaji
made about 2 applications
to the Amil of Kolardal
8th and 9th April 1890
mostly

notly worded in Con-
-formity with the remarks
he had made at foot
of the notice ispecto him
by the Amicolar.

H.V

Views submitted to
to the Council -
13/9

S.1/9 A.C.

34

~~Petition Rs~~

Recd ~~Petition~~ from the Dy Comr dated 17 ~~August~~ March 1888

Rs 1992 of Sun
576.

This office Diary No 3 of 1888

Recd ~~from~~ from Dorkel dated 5 June 1888 Rs 509
169

The Sum ordered to be received thereof the surveyed compared & assessed by the Survey Dept, but for the present year, the recorded Survey C-2 No 28-13-7 may be collected.

dd
4/1/1889

12

(37)

Pm No 1203 dated
20th August 1920
to

PK
Appajee
Rayanguttadar
Kalaburagi
Dt

PK Complaining against the
resumption of the so called
Shanbhog Inam

It seems already recorded
by opinion that the
resumption was
arbitrary — It is for
the Deputy to settle
whether the resumption
or dealing with re-grant
the matter

V.P.
15/9/20

[illegible]
15/9

Charged on account of ~~the~~ Sayer, ~~Abkary~~
following items.
Sayer
Abkary.
Sendi.
Total

~~Sendi~~ & am ~~K~~
~~The amount claimed~~
on account of Rent
3 items amounting to
Rs 3066.

1 ~~From the objection~~ It is stated that the above items of Revenue had been assumed by Govt, prior to the sale of the village in 1878, & the Govt collected any Revenue on their account.

2 The Govt Memorandum under Chief Commrs No dated 8th Oct 1873 No 3697, the Management of the Collection of Sayer & Abkary Revenue was assumed by Govt & the Sayer duty has been since abolished. No payment on account of these items appears to have been made to the ~~Talukdars~~ Talukdars ~~by~~ ~~Government~~ purchased ~~Villages~~, either by Govt or by the Abkary contractor. The Govt do ~~not~~ seem to have ~~claimed~~ the Talukdar can be called upon to pay the demand on account of these items. The Dy Comr

~~As the question is of some importance~~ can be considered in connection with the other charges in the suit. X

No. 3 dated 31 January 1879

1. Petitioner
C. Rajagopala
Mudaliar of Kalavai
Represented by
Mr. Advocate
Venkatramiah

Petitioner contests the Revenue valuation of the Rayangudi village of Kalavai in a Revenue sale held for arrears of Revenue in 1878. In the sale notice the amount payable on the Village was not specified as a certain amount charged on this & some other Villages in a lump had not been apportioned on the several Villages. The apportionment has been since made, & the Petitioner was asked to pay the amount with arrears. Petitioner is willing to pay the amount claimed deducting the sums

Charged on account of ~~the~~ Sayer, ~~Abkary~~
~~&~~ Sendi & arrears
~~The amount~~ claimed
on account of Excise
3 items amounting to
No 3066.

following items
Sayer
Abkary.
Sendi.
Total

~~No~~ Petn
No ~~further~~ objection ~~is~~ to the
items of Revenue had been realised
by Govt, prior to the sale of the Village
in 1878 & he never collected any
Revenue on their account.—

2 The Govt Order under Chap
Comptr's No dated 8th Oct 1873 No 3697,
the Management of the Collection of Sayer
& Abkary Revenue was assigned by Govt & the
Sayer duty has been since abolished. No payment
on account of these items appears to have been
made to the ~~Revenue~~ Petitioners ~~Contractors~~ ~~or~~ ~~Farmers~~
~~purchasers~~ ~~Lessees~~, either by Govt or by the
Abkary contractor. The Collr is of opinion that
~~the Govt~~ ~~has~~ the Petitioner ~~can~~ cannot be
called upon to pay the demand on
account of these items.— The Dy Comr

As the question is a complicated one
the Comm
in comm
with the other
villages in the Dis

is ~~to~~ requested
to not to demand
from Petitioner till
further orders the
sums charged on
account of Dayar
Bandi & Amanat &
to submit a complete
report in regard to
all the Rayanguli
receipts of Rs. &
stating ~~the cases~~
in what cases the
Rayanguli included
charges on account
of Dayar & Abkary,
& in what cases the
Rayanguli ~~did~~ did
continue to receive
payments from the
Abkary contractors
on account of the sale
of Bandi & Amanat.

3, As regards the
other items of Revenue
payable by Petitioner,

N & to what extent



he can only
be called upon to
pay the arrears
of years subsequent
to 1878 when he
purchased the Village,
& not of those prior
to it. If any duty
is due on account
of 1878 rates, the
only liable to pay
~~pay~~ is the proprietor
then owner for the
months during which
he had possession
of the Village.
A fresh notice
should be issued
to Petitioner stating
the correct amount
payable by him
with reference to the
foregoing instructions.

[illegible]
13/12/91

14/12/91

Mr. Patrick -

Secretary of the Treasury -

Washington D.C.

Sir -

I have the honor to
request that you will
cause a draft for
Twenty Five Dollars
to be forwarded to
me at Bridgeport
Conn. in favor of
Capt. Henry Hunne
for Pilotage on board
the Ship Columbia
from Bridgeport to
Greenwich -

Very Respectfully
Your Obedient Servant
Charles Pell

In this case that means on account of Capt Hunne
he wishes it placed there
Hunne's bill - In this case
it is important to state
position is not Superintendent
Keeper -

Letter Concerning

Ref

Meeting with
Atlas Reg[istry] No 3530
D530

13 May 1893

Minutes of the
Proceedings at a
Meeting held at
Atlas Mountain
Hotel Mountain of
Atlas on Saturday

Certainly I can pass no orders on a bundle of papers sent in this manner. If you send me a note explaining the points requiring orders, & the facts connected with each point, I shall pass orders. It is very hard upon a councillor to be told to read all the rubbish to make out what is required

A.C.

19/12/93

Mr Rainey & Jeyes

Kindly Continue

Peter Rheinstein

2/12

Accompanied with the date

Forwarded
to Mr. Counter.
The only Matter
which the Com-
-mittee had
to do here
was Counsel fees
+ Mr Ryan's Work for
as settled in that
Judgment

General Registry
467a
Re Inspection of Perth
Lic No 6 & 8 of D. & Co
the Subject.
J.H.C.
Minute slip to Board
10/3 Sent for above file: 13 6 & 7 &
was sent to Inspector Dawson
per requisition of 27-4-97
10-376
J.H.C. 10/3/98
Subd:
H.S. 10/3.
Subd
J.H.C.
10/3/98

Subd H.S.

Dear Sir Alfred
Re the action of the
Dry Farms Association
Limited. This was
withdrawn by him to
the District Court before
which the Magistrate
Court was sitting. The
Plaintiff in the Court is not clear.
A decree seems to have
been signed whether
for costs alone, or
for restoration of
the land also, We
Dry Farmers do not
know. I think it was
a Court of Equity the
Dry Farmers Association
Limited - The Dry

Inward Office
Rev. Dept.

Chief Engineer's Office Record

Please find up a copy of the
Genl. Pic. of the premises referred to
within.

W.
13.

Counsel may be entitled to obtain a copy of the judgment, decree & record on the appeal. He may also submit an application to move for a short adjournment of the execution case - so much necessary. Otherwise, the application for may be placed at his disposal.

Early orders are solicited -

11-3-98

D2-10.Am
11/3

Urgent

To
The Hon'ble
The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore

Sir,

Petition for the restoration of the Revenue & the Maniagar of Mysore.

Most Respected Sir

I the undersigned Kariah village of Kavenahally most respectfully beg leave to bring the following few lines to your kind consideration with a hope that justice will be done to me.

In the year 1808 the Shanbogue village of Kaylanur in the Taluk of Davenahally was sold for arrears of "Gotta" (Government due) and purchased by me, in public auction and in our since in possession and enjoyment. The former Gotta was himself Shanbogue of the same, but was dismissed for his fraudulent dealings with the Government. Lately in the year 1881 one Puttiah was created Shanbogue. From the time of the formation of the village 4 Kilagas 10 parties of wet land and 17 parties of dry land have been set apart as service inam and is to be enjoyed by the Shanbogue. When I purchased the village the said dry land Shanbogue service inam was lying waste as Shanbogue Puttiah's predecessor was doing only the wet land.

The new Shanbogue on assuming the office in collusion with the former Gottadar misrepresented

lately transferred to the latter Taluk.

I now beg to bring the following points for your honour's kind consideration since which it will be clear that the disputed lands are not the service Inam lands —

(1) Inam accounts disclose only the existance of a Shanuroga service Inam, in connection with the village of Kayalpore, giving out measurements just 1 Candy 4 Kolagay's padies and dry 10 Kolagay's padies but no specification of the spots given.

(2) It has been clearly made out, in the local investigation by the Amildar, which is the only safe guide in cases of this nature, that that fixed by the surveying officer is the service Inam which exactly tallies with the measurements given in the Inam accounts.

(3) The disputed lands measure 3 Candies 3 and 1 Candy is Kolagay dry as also 4 Kolagay "Amarooe" holding nearly 50 Tamarind trees. This is more than three times the measurements of the service Inam entered in the Inam accounts.

(4) The disputed land comprising seven patches of land i.e. three patches of wet and five patches of dry land, as also Tamarind Topes situated or scattered in different places, and yields produce of more than 200 rupees every year and its cost 1500 Rupees. The whole Kayalgootta village was sold for (2500 rupees) bearing annuity to Government the sum of (1300 Rupees). While it is the Ryot can pay the gootta amount of

all my prayers and declare justice, declare
Puttiah who is merely an intruder to record
to Law for a declaration of his title if such
there be and the property in dispute to remain
with me as being part and parcel of my
Vengangotta village undisturbed. The Crop
on the disputed property is ready to be re-
-aped and if timely reviews be not given it
shall have to undergo a heavy loss. Hoping
that my humble appeal will be heard
and disposed of according to the meri

I remain
Most Respected Sir
Your Honors most obedient and humble
"Signed" Vasuba Chipagar

[illegible]

28-

1883. 8467

AR(11-82-2

From

To The Secretary

Secretary to Chief Commissioner of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Dated 16th February 1883

Despatched 16/2

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 1206

No. 629. } 1883

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF MYSORE
4

(4)

No 1916
627

[illegible]

[illegible]

To,

[illegible]

Sir,

[illegible]

29

(General Serial No. 31)

1883/4 (9)

From The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District.

Dated 27 August 1883.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. One

General No. 2539.

No. 107.

Revenue Department 14 1/2

dated 14th February 1850.

R 41-88-3

Sir forwarding copy of abstract of correspondence relating to the Shankay Inam land, produced by Poottiya in person requesting submission of the entire correspondence referred to therein, as also the receipt obtained by the Shankar for having put him in possession of the Inam land and also the Pymaishi account of 1850 showing the Inam

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]ylasandra Amany [illegible] Information [illegible]

[illegible]quired as to what were the Causes of [illegible]

[illegible]bsconded was sent in pursuance of Shan[illegible]

By Order

[illegible]

[illegible]

Secretary.

No. 12.
" 50

3rd Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kota district
Dated Bommidi the 29th April 1864.

(10)

To
The Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Revenue department.

Sir,

With reference to your circular No. 2539/137, dated the 7th August last calling for certain further correspondence relating to the Shanbhog Vatan in the Agraharam Village of the Kolar Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith as per accompanying Jamabandi & the papers on the subject as were available among the records of the Kolar Taluk, together with the statement given before the Amildar by Narrana, son of Pattah to the effect that the enclosed file contains all that was existing & the records in question do not show clearly for which were the lands of which Govindappa was put in possession as Shanbhoge, but it appears that the produce of the Shanbhogi Inam lands was ordered to be delivered over to him.

The enclosures of your above-cited circular reply is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient humble
servant
Deputy Commissioner

Sum of Rs
be credited
in 1892 on
21-12-93

32

R 41-82-11

1884. 8

From

The Deputy [illegible]

Kolar

To

The Secretary

Secretary to ~~Chief Commissioner~~ of Mys

Revenue Departme

Dated 2nd 8

Despatched 2/5 "

Received "

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 20
No. 50 } 1884—8

Submitting [illegible]
Correspondence [illegible]
to the Standing [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

135.

(General Serial No. 31.)

1884.

*From*

(11)

To Sub Commissioner Tahsildar
~~Comptroller~~
Subdivisional Officer.

LR 41-82-5

*Dated* 21st June

*Despatched*

*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.* 1869-10

No. 91

Passing orders in the case of Venkata Narayana of Avanibalu, appealing against the Commissioner rejecting the Chenchu certificate claimed by Petr.

Petn Branch

(11)

Re: q the Revenue

Read, letter from the Dy Commissioner Kolar, No 74 16 629 dy 14 Feb 88, enclg report on the petition from Kanaka Appajiya of Devanahalli praying against the order granting the Champagne certain lands claimed by petitioner.

Read, letter cito 120/80 q 29 April 88, from the same enclg further correspondence, relating to the Champagne's land in the Hyalaoor village q the Kolar Taluk.

Order,

No 1809-10/91 q 21. 6. 88

The Avildars proceedings in ~~meting~~ Champagne Pattanaik from the lands in question which were in his possession were ~~most~~ irregular and improper, and the Dy Commissioner rightly Cancelled those proceedings by

his

39

Register Deeds Office
Bo Boundary 27th June 84

(12)

No 3040
407

Endorsement

LR 41-82-6

In reply to this letter
of 15th January 1883 Appli
cant Kayemsuttadur
of Kyaluar - Custod
Derwanlall is informed
that the Deeds do
not interfere with
the orders of the depu
ties and enquiries
Mr Ricketts case of
21st November 1882 X
Petitioner has no
interest of any kind
to advance in submit
ting his complaint - The
Survey authorities have
been directed to frame
the settlement in
accordance with the

X Khan Bahadur Ahmadbegue
Collaymuth in Protection
of the Land in Suit

44

14

Read:-

Decree Proceedings No. 1809 of 91.

Dated 21st June 1894.

1911-8.2-7

enjoining the order against Dy. Comm. Gooty in Petn. dated 21st December 1892, in regard to the lands attached in Kanakapur file of Kyalamur Village.

Read. Petition No. 3321 and affidavit from Chandrappa Patteamadi, submitting a copy of the Judgment in O.S. No. 259 of 88 on the file of the Munsiff of Kadiri, adjudging the lands in question belong to the Rayapuradar of Kyalamur.

Order thereon:-

The decision of the Munsiff in O.S. No 259 of 1884 is not binding upon the Govt., so as to include the lands in question in the Rayapuram Village of Kyalamur. The lands in question are situated

S. 318-19 of 1/3. ÷. 85 21

4 2

for purposes other than the remuneration of the Landlord which they are attached, they are liable to be resumed by the Government. The Dy. Comm.r will report how the matter now stands.

Lands & Mines

CR

Seen.

1. The Dy. Com.r Kolar Dt. with the papers returned
2. The Survey Superintendent.

No. 52 A.
12

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kulitalai Division
Karur District
29th July 1865.

(18)

To
The Secretary to the Board
of Revenue
Revenue Department.

Sir,

Adverting to the Board's Proceedings No. 3-2 of the 21st April last and subsequent correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to state that the petitioner Sooriamma claims certain lands as appertaining to his office of Shanbogue of the Nyalmur village while the Native Amuttiff declared those fields as part and parcel of the lands belonging to the Kurumbas of Nyalmur the latter having alleged that these are not Shanbogi Inam. From the copy of the decree enclosed in the above petition it appears that the Amuttiff's finding is not based upon any reliable or recognized public records, but upon the oral evidence adduced by the parties to the suit. This alone would not do for the satisfactory settlement of the question between the Shanbogue and Kayangnuttadar. It is necessary to ascertain with reference to Revenue Records which of the lands is Shanbogue Inam. An account of recent sales

renting

* Original Nos. 3 & 4 dated 5-5-65
Cancelled as No. 2 & 3 dated 7th June 1865.

Original Nos. 2 & 3 of the 22nd July 1865.

46

LA 41-82-8

From

Asstt. Commissioner
Kolar District.

To

The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore, Revenue Dept.

Dated 29th Aug. 1885
Recd 31st August 1885.

No. 548/92. Encl.

Reporting that the delay in disposal of Poolamada petitions is owing to his own default of preserving certain accounts in the Chamundeshwari Inam Cash matter of Kyalada Hobli & requesting further time for search of the said accounts.

Vernacular Record for
early reply.
4/8/85.

among the records of your office
for the old Pymaish account
of the Nagunguti village of Kyalu
which formerly belonged to the
late Mwainakali Sule K. Bungu
-lue District, and forward the same to me for reference
I have also written to the Deputy
Commissioner of Nyasaland en-
-quiring if they are forthcoming
in the records of this office.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient

[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner

bearing on the point are available here. So it is desirable to refer to the old accounts such as Ramaiah Nattiar of Neo-dhana (1915-6) or Chokkaya (1886-7) prepared before Kyalmen village was granted as Nayenyatta, so they may show the position and extents for the purposes of identification. —

2. The petitioner in his petition statement filed in this office on the 19th June 1886, promised to produce these accounts within 15 days but he failed to do so, while he himself is then understood he has addressed to the Assistant Commissioner dated 20th and 29th June and 8th July respectively, to which your Nos 213 and 214 of the 9th and 22nd July gave answer complaining that I did not dispose of his case. The delay is due to nothing but to his not producing reliable accounts to establish his contention. —

3. I would therefore request that you will be good enough to cause a search to be made among

47

(General Serial No. 30.)

1885.

(17)

*From*

*The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.*

*To*

The Deputy Commissioner Kolar Dist.

*Dated* 5th August 85.

*Despatched* 8/8

*Received*

**Enclosures No. 6.**

*General No.* 2679 R

*No.* 95.

R 241-82-9

His Letter No. 575 dated 29th July 1885, requesting to be furnished for reference, the Papers & Cattle connected with the Kyatadi village of the late Devindalli, now Kolar Taluk.

In reply, informs that the accounts referred to in the above, are not forthcoming in the Records of this office, and forwards herewith the Rowlapar Inamdar Somasar Patil dated 1st Sept. 1873 of the villages transferred from the Jangamkota to the Mandibelle Taluk, received from the Supdt. of the late Bangalore Division for reference, which may be returned when no longer required.

A

148

It is presumed, however
the Spanish account
by the Despatch
with the enclosure
Russian Charge
of the late

4d

(General Serial No. 29.)

1886 225-3

161

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

LR 41-82-10

To

Chief
The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Venkatarangiengar
Memo -
22-6-86

Dated 15th
Despatched 19th } June
Received

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 1.67 } 1886-87.
No. 183

Suggests that the Shan-
bhoga Inam of the Kayam
Patta Tayalnur village, Ko
lar Taluk which has been
resumed by the Munsiff
of Kolar in favor of the
Kayamguttadars, may be
restored and its full as-
sessment may be added to the patta
amount.

To Sanad

50

No. 415
183

538
1885

Supreme Court of Illinois,
March term,
A.D. 1885.

To

The Clerk of the Circuit Court
of Cook County.

Sir,

At the March term of the Supreme Court of this State, begun and held at the City of Springfield, within and for the State aforesaid, on the 3rd day of said month, among other proceedings had in the cause of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, appellant, vs. Mary Ann Ryan, appellee, by the consideration of the Court it was ordered, adjudged and decreed, that the decree of the Circuit Court in this cause be and the same is hereby affirmed at the cost of the appellant, and that execution issue therefor.

I am directed by the Court to certify to you the foregoing order, and to command you that such execution and other proceedings be had in said cause, as according to law and the practice of this Court ought to be had.

Witness the Hon. Alfred M. Craig, Chief Justice of said Court, and the seal thereof, at Springfield, this 3rd day of March, A.D. 1885.

Attest

Clerk.

has taken possession of the house
surveyed included it into his private land
taking away the house from his possession
and restoring it to the Ahambagai to be
thereafter appointed under the present
order granted above is not worth the
trouble, nor desirable as the Kayangatta
has does not care for nor requires the
services of a Ahambagai at his village.
For these reasons, I would suggest that
the Ahambagai Inam in dispute may
be resumed and its full assessment
Rs 3-0-0 added to the Sirkar amount
payable by the Kayangattadar, subject
of course to the revision at the survey
settlement.

6. The enclosures of the Proceedings and
Plans under acknowledgment along with
the records connected with the case are
herewith returned as per accompanying
Receipt.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

D.C.

Khairabari is given as the remaining
= ing Revenue Circuit which does not
to decide that the Court adjudged to Kyun
= jitsaree the Cause as there mentioned
in the said order. But the petitioner
next Court to show cause why the Rule
the necessary Writ shall not
possible to see how that Revenue the Act
Mentioned Officer would have attached
to the Document and it does before him.
5. By that the Learned order No 104 of the
petitioner was, based on the Conclusion
Reported by Jhingaree Tea Company the
Respect to this Case, the Revenue the petitioner
Petitioner Right to the office, and the
later no Consequence Could to Have any
Connection whatever with the Chukhagee
attached to Kyaliram and the Con cy Law =
= Report said, Conclusion the terminated in
his favor. The Duty of the Chukhagee
office, for which the petitioner Petitioner
was appointed, Consists of Village Ch
Tea, Rice, and 2 Three separate Revenue
Lands for their respective Chukhagee, while
he is Now entitled to the Profit of Lands,
Being the Only Remuneration the Duty
Revenue will be assigned to the
Chukhagee of Khairabari Now and Then
under the existing rules. The Record in
this Case show that the Chukhagee
Office ceased to be attached to Kyaliram
some years ago so as to the Case of all
other Chukhagee. — Their Lordships
unanimously Reject the Accounts Mentioned —
Besides, the Jurisdiction of Kyaliram

thus

* 1. Khairabari, Chukhagee
2. Chutiyatuli, Near Village.
3. Bidyanatha Chukhagee
Now Do —

filed in the proceedings. 51

3. The Register of the Kingsgate village, prepared in the Lease department with reference to the Standard Survey, discovered that the originally noted lease has been assigned to the Countryside Office of Kingsgate subject to payment of a part-rent of £80. 4. The municipal decision is based mainly on the oral evidence offered by the to the rent, but not on any documentary evidence of the payment, which has been lodged in the civil lease under reference. He referred to the old Kingsgate lease accounts relating to the village, but the description therein given of the lease land is not clear to most of an easy and satisfactory identification of the same. The petitioner produces a copy which there is a Caveat order issued by the Auditor of the late Kingsgate Relief Office, known as Register, 1912-14. This document does not set out the land originally assigned for the Kingsgate Lease. I directed the Note Taker thereto, to inspect the land under dispute in the presence of all and ascertained, that the village and report as to the boundaries given in the Kingsgate lease tally with the description given in the old order referred to above. The result of the enquiries made by the Chief Bailiff

| | |
|---|---|
| [illegible] | [illegible] |
| [illegible] | [illegible] |
| [illegible] | [illegible] |
| total | 12-7-4 |
| rental paid | 2-7-4 |
| balance due | 10-0-0 |

Order

The decision [illegible] is not binding upon the [illegible]

[illegible] lands in question [illegible]

0-4
0-4-0 14-8-84 కళ్ళు
0-4-0 12-9-84 కళ్ళు
0-4-0 10-10-84 కళ్ళు
0-4-0 10-10-84 కళ్ళు
0-4-0 15-12-84 కళ్ళు
0-4-0 14-11-84 కళ్ళు
0-8-0 20-11-84 కళ్ళు
2-8-0 25-7-84 కళ్ళు
[illegible] 5-1-85
[illegible]

18-12-0

[illegible]

[illegible] 23-9-85

ಇದ್ದಕ್ಕಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಅವನ ಮುಖದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬಗೆಯ ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯ ಮೂಡಿತು. ಅವನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಅವನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಧ್ವನಿಸಿದವು. ಅವನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ಇತ್ತ

1

2

3

4

5

[redacted]

ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಮೊದಲಿನಂತೆ ಅಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ಮನೆಯವರು ನನ್ನನ್ನು ಕಂಡರೆ ಮೊದಲಿನಂತೆ ಪ್ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಅಸಡ್ಡೆ ಇರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು

ಪುಟ 5/

ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಇದೇ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಇರಬೇಕು ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಪರಿಪೂರ್ಣತೆ ಕಾಣಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದ್ದು.

Cr. No. 3/926

13-7-85

79.

No 6

possession and enjoyment with the whole village.

The Defendant has been throughout investigation of the former holders of the village claiming the lands as shanboque of the village since 21st November 1882 and the Deman Sahib has referred the Plaintiff to a civil court on the 27th June 1884.

The Defendant is not the shanboque of the village and he never did the duties thereof. The Plaintiff alone does the shanboque and other duties of the village. Plaintiff is the Puchi. dar shanboque and not Defendant. Shanboque lands are separate.

Judgment is prayed for Plaintiff rights to lands being declared as against Defendant and costs.

3. The suit came on for settlement of issues on the 25th August and 8th September 1884. On both dates the Defendant was ex parte and an ex parte judgment was passed on the 8th September 1884.

4. On the application of the Defendant

Defendant the ex parte judgment was set aside on 20th October and for settlement of issues on 11th and 20th November 1882.

5. The Plaintiff was represented by Lud Venkatachary 1st Class Pleader.

6. The Defendant was represented by Lud Subbachary 2d Class Pleader and he filed the following written statement.

The scheduled lands do not belong to Kayemgootta but they are Shanbogue Inamty. They never never sold.

The Plaintiff cannot maintain this suit without producing sale certificate.

The Plaintiff never enjoyed the lands.

The lands belongs to Government and Government gave it to Defendant as Inam for Shanbogay in May 1881 and since in Defendants enjoyment.

Plaintiff is not a shanbogue nor did he ever perform its duties nor there is necessity for it.

There are no separate lands

for the office of chandagus.

Unless Plaintiff establishes his right to chandogny Fuck, he cannot maintain this suit.

Government ought to be made a party since the lands were given to defendant by Government

Defendant not liable to costs.

Plaint stamp insufficient.)

Suit must therefore be dismissed.

7. The following issues were settled

I. Whether or not the plaint lands were purchased by the Plaintiff in Revenue sale as part and parcel of the Kayemgutta village?

II. Whether or not the plaint lands are attached to the office of chandogue?

III. Whether or not the suit is maintainable?

IV. Whether or not there is defect of parties?

V. Whether or not the Plaintiff was in sole possession and enjoyment of the plaint lands?

VI. Whether the plaint stamp is sufficient,

VII. Whether or not the Plaintiff is entitled to the Relief claimed?

8. The suit came on for final hearing on the 19th January and 3d 4th and 5th February 1885.

9. The parties were represented as before.

10. The Plaintiff examined 9 witnesses and filed Exhibits A to I.

A. } Depositions given in Defendant
B. } suit in Civil Suit No: 5 of
1883 on the file of this Court.

C. Deposition given by Defendant before the Amildar of Devanahally Taluq dated 22d February 1882.

D. Petition presented by Defendant to Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District dated 2d September 1881.

E. Do — Do — to the Amildar of Devandahally Taluq dated 26th January 1882.

F. } Petitions presented by Defend-
G. } ant to the Deputy Commissioner
H. } of Bangalore District.
I. }

J. Do — Do to the Amildar of Devandahally Taluq.

K. Title Deed & Exam Statement.

L. Sundayem Receipts.

M. Village Patay Jutty dated 2nd November 1878.

N. Proclamation.

O. Boundary of Kalinoor village.

P. Bond executed by Vagees to Chikka Nagannah.

Q. Sundayem Receipts.

R. Do- Do.

S. Plaintiff's Surkat.

T. Order in Criminal Case No: 49 of 1879 on the file of the 1st Class Assistant Commissioner's Court Bangalore.

U. The Defendant Examined 3 witnesses and filed exhibits — to XXX.

I. Demand Proceedings.

II. } Kistdi accounts.
III. }
IV. }
V. }

VI. Surkalika executed by Kyats to Government.

VII. Patty showing the Cash Kept in Amanut.

VIII. Endorsement given by the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore to the Amildar of Devanhally

1887

on the petition of the Defendant

dated 2nd September 1882.

IX. Sheriff's report dated 24th January 1883.

X. Copy Writ of Execution Fieri.

XI. Order given by the Amildar of Denkanikotta to the Sheristar of Kallally. dated 3rd October 1880.

XII. Do — Do — 3rd June 1881.

XIII. Plaint schedule.

XIV. } Orders & Decree given by
XV. } the Amildar of Denkanikotta
to Sheristar of Kallally.

XVI. Do. — Do — Do

XVII } Encumbrances received by Agent
XVIII } to Government.

XIX. Do — Do — Do

XX. Encumbrances given by Agent to Government.

XXI. Do — given by Sheristar and others to Venkatachala.

XXII. Boundary putty.

XXIII. Encumbrance given by Sheristar to Rayapanahalli.

XXIV. Notice issued in Execution Case No: 3 of 1878 on the file of the Munsiff's Court Denkanikotta Principal Commissioners Court.

XXV. Receipt for payment made.

XXVI. Depositions given by Subadars Row

before the Principal of Devastanam
12. For sake of convenience I
will treat the 2d Issue in the case
before the 1st as it would, I think, rend
my decision on the latter easy. The
2d issue is the important issue in the
case on the decision of which the de-
-cision of the suit hinges. Before
going into the evidence I have to pre-
-mise that the Defendant was formerly
a Goomasta in the late Chinnajatam
Zalug and having been thrown out of
service in the Reduction of Establish-
-ment he was appointed by the then
Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore
in the year 1882 as Shanbogue of the
Kayemgutta Village of Kadanoor where
in the lands in dispute are situated.
The Defendant was neither a Relation
of the Kayemguttadars nor the Represent-
-atives of any of those who have been
doing the duties of Shanbogue. The im-
-portation, therefore, of a Stranger
into the Village and the change of the
Kayemgoothadars under certain circum-
-stances which will hereafter be
noticed in its due place and which
has caused a faction, as it were, be-

tween

between the old and new Registration
- dates are the main causes of endless
trouble to government and to the pres-
-ent litigation.

13. Now the bone of contention
is lands, which, it appears, were
assigned over to the Shanbogue Mutt
free as remuneration for his duties
as the Shanbogue. On the appointment
of the defendant, the Amildar seems
to have directed the Sheristar of the
Pettah to put the defendant in posses-
-sion of these lands. The Sheristar seems
to have got hold of some old lists of
measurements of the Shanbogue lands
and obtained information from some
former Shanbogues (who were deputed
of the office in turn from the same
Shanbogue) and acted upon these
materials in putting out to the defend-
-ant the lands in dispute. The statements
of the defendants' witnesses - hence
a series of complaints were made
to the Amildar, the deputy Commissioner
and other Revenue Authorities by the
parties concerned. A volume of corres-
-pondence ensued and ended in the Amil's
orders marked Exhibit — in the Case -

Revenue
of Miscellaneous Proceedings. Vol. 47

these records show as already observed
in my judgment in Equity Suit No: 5[illegible]
of 1883 on the file of this Court against
this very Defendant in a similar suit
by one of the tenants of the village, that
any responsible competent Revenue offi-
cer had been to the spot and marked
off the lands of Chandagam on personal
local investigation and with reference
to any recognized documentary account,
or, public record. If this had been done
at the outset it may have put a stop
to this protracted litigation between the
parties. Be this as it may, now at the
the evidence before me, the Plaintiffs,
the purchasers of the Layengutta village
in public auction in satisfaction of Govern-
ment Revenue dues, brings this suit
for a declaration of his exclusive right
to the lands thus given over to the De-
fendants by the Revenue Authorities
the same being urged to be Chundagam
lands attached to the village.

In. The evidence in the case is not
very satisfactory and I must confess
that it is not without some difficulty
and hesitation I have to arrive at a

conclusion

conclusion and say who has a right to the lands as between the contesting parties. A number of documents are filed by both the parties, but none of these, I am sorry, give me a clue to find out which is the land referred to in each. The lists of measurements upon which the Sheristdar acted in giving possession have been produced (Vide Nos. 3 to 7 correspondence ending with Exhibit I). None of these bear the seal and signature of a competent authority nor are they shown to have come out from proper custody within the meaning of the Indian Evidence Act. Such documents may, I think be easily got up especially when the parties concerned are knowing and hostile to each other. The Plaintiffs filed Exhibit S, his application to the Darkhast Collectory for copies of original lists of this nature and this is endorsed to the effect that no such documents are forthcoming in the records. The several Exhibits having thus become of less value in elucidat

the matters at issue, I have to rely greatly on the oral evidence adduced by the parties. The witnesses on behalf of the Plaintiff prove that the lands in suit formed Cumbayam land that were in the occupation of different tenders under Kayamgutta-dar and that the Chambagouse rent free lands are distinct from these lands. The three witnesses examined by the defendant are the Shembaiar and two others. As already observed the evidence of the Shembaiar is biased, as it were, more, or, less upon hearsay. The statements of the other two witnesses themselves betray their enmity between each of them and the Plaintiff. The, 2d of these is the Patail who admits having preferred a criminal complaint against the Plaintiff, the result of which is known - while the 2d is the Kayamgutadar on whose default to pay Government dues, the village was put up to auction. He states that he had paid Rs: 1000, to the Plaintiff -

at the time when the latter purchased the village to secure for him, the witness a half share in the property and that he was ultimately deceived. I think it, therefore, perfectly unsafe to believe in their statements. The Defendant himself when examined as the 1st witness for Plaintiff states that it is intended that he should enjoy the lands free for his duties as shanbogue under Government; that he is not a servant of the Rayenguttadar, nor, does he keep the accounts of Rayenguttadar lands and village, nor is he subordinate to the Rayenguttadar and that he is, in short, a superintending authority over the Rayenguttadar. Thus it seems to be clear that the Defendant wishes to ignore the rights of the Rayenguttadar and its advantages of the position given to him by the Government and with the aid of the influence of the Plaintiff to usurp the lands to which he is not entitled

16. From all these facts, it seems

to me moreover that the Defend-
-ants witnesses are as one to wind
the Plaintiff and seem no means ad-
-ming effect to it seems to have got
up this intrigue themselves, assisting
-lmid the screen to help the Defendan
by getting up materials for him as
far as they could. Under all these
circumstances I find that the
plaint-lands are not attached
to the office of shanbogue.

17. With regard to the 1st Issue,
It had been found that the lands were
not attached to the office of shanbogue
and the Plaintiff has purchased the
whole of the village in auction. Vide
Exhibits En and E. It is true follow
that they form part of the Kayem-
-gutta village. This is my finding
on the issue.

18. About the 3d Issue, the Defend
-ants contention is that the Plaintiff
cannot maintain the suit unless he
produces the sale certificate and
unless he establishes his rights to the
office of shanbogue. Now, as regard
the sale certificate, I do not see
how this plea is tenable. The non

of sale and the list of bids offered at the sale and prepared at the time are produced i.e. Schedules M. and N. The certificate is a formal title Deed prepared on both these documents. I am therefore of opinion that both the documents M and N, are as much proofs of Plaintiffs title and more than the certificate itself.

19. As regards the necessity for the Plaintiff to establish his right to the office of Chairman, the plea is not the point - the more so in the face of the Plaintiff claiming the land as Ais Gundayen land attached to the Kayemputta Village. I therefore find this issue in the affirmative.

20. As regards the 4th Issue, the Defendant contends that Government should have been made a party. Government may have been added as a party but I do not think, that the omission to do so can in any way invalidate the Plaintiffs claim, in as much as the Plaintiff seeks a declaration of his title as against the Defendant. Section 31 of the Code of

Civil

Civil Procedure provides that no suit shall be defeated on the ground of misjoinder of parties and the Court may deal with the matter in controversy as far as regards the interests of parties actually before it. Here as the Plaintiff seeks a declaration only as against the Defendant I am at a loss to see the reason how the suit may be regarded as defective of parties ~~of parties~~ and therein sus. With this observation I find the issue in the negative.

21. Regarding the 3rd Issue, I think I have sufficiently dwelt upon the parol testimony on behalf of the Plaintiff in decreeing the 2nd Issue. There is proof in the evidence to show that the lands, in suit, are in the occupation of tenants paying rent to Plaintiff - I therefore find that plaintiff lands were in possession and enjoyment of the Plaintiff.

22. Regarding the 4th Issue, the Defendant has not shown how the plaint stamp is insufficient. The Plaintiff has stamped the plaint with the

1796

the stamp needed for a writ for a declaration of title - which alone he could in this suit - Whereupon that issue in the affirmative.

23. My finding on the 1st and the last issue is that the Plaintiff is for the reasons assigned in the foregoing issues, entitled to the relief claimed.

24. I accordingly direct that a decree be passed declaring the Plaintiff to be the rightful owner of the plaint - Cocoanut land as against the defendant with costs.

Pronounced in open Court.

Kolar 20th February 1885.

(Signed) C. C. Swaminathan Pillay
Commissioner

"Copy"

Commissioner

Memo.

Copy applied for by the defendant on 27th Febry 1885.

do. ready for delivery on 2nd March 1885

do. delivered on 4/3/85.

Words 2637.

Copying fee Rs: 2-8-0

Commissioner

Kolar 20th February 1885.

Valuation: 3-3-0

Stamp required: 2-4-0

Stamp affixed (Cancelled)



193

Judgment

D. C. No. 377 of 1883.

Before the Court of the Munsiff
of Polur

Present Srimath C. C. Jagadambal Pillay
Munsiff

Plaintiff — Defendant

Narayana
deceased by his L. Pentiah
representative
Papah

The suit is brought for recovery of the possession of the land after establishing the right of Plaintiff and without allowing the Defendant to cultivate the same with costs.

The Plaint is as follows:-

II Amt

The land described in the sche=dule is the Mundayem land be=longing to Plaintiff, and it is within the jurisdiction of this Court.

2 The Defendant trespassed on the said land in the month of November 1883 and ploughed the same.

3. Though the Defendant was prevented from ploughing the land, yet he objects on the ground that the land is his The cause of action accrued in the month of November.

4. Prays for Judgment for recovery of possession of the land after establishing the right of Plaintiff and

ment shut and without allowing the Defendant to cultivate the same with Court costs.

The suit came on for settlement of issues on the 30th January 1884.

The Plaintiff was represented by Mr. Subatalan 1st Class Pleader.

The Defendant appeared in person and made the following statement.

The land specified in the schedule does not belong to Plaintiff as his Emdayam land. It is my Adanabogam land, Saram, which I got in May 1881 from Government. I let it for cultivation on Varam

11 Sept. Cause of Pemberton, writer in Regent or Strauber of the same [illegible]. She was certain documents in possession which this Court ought Duress of life. She was ordered allowed to call production the Cause.

The following cause was settled Writer the Law Officers in the Court Schedule is the Synagogue Jews Court of the Defendants, are Company Law of the Pemberton Additional issue.

Dix the Defendant Case the Court of Pemberton.

The case came on for final hearing on the 24th March

The parties as before.

The Pemberton's counsel

Plaint. Witness was filed in exhibito

The Defendant examined no
witness was filed exhibito
I to V

I Petition given by Defendant
for Lease.

II Do to Survey office

III - Lease.

IV Plaintiff for putting the
procure in deposit

V. - Copy of Records exhibit.

With regard to the 1st issue the Plaintiff proves by the evidence of his witnesses that the Plaintiff and was leased to him by the Mayem-
-oostadas Shajiah Plaintiff
2 1/4 miles, and that he is in enjoyment since six years
paying Eleven rupees to the Sarq

II that said Kayemgoa Master of the
Defendant relies Exhibit 3 copy of the Davis
order No. 1809-0/91 as also the
Miscellaneous Revenue Records
on which it is based and
which are for sake of reference
tacked with Exhibit 3 the
Davis order, but the Defen-
dant has failed to adduce
evidence to prove that the
papers relate to the land
in question. Though he was aware
that it was necessary and
ample time was given him
for the purpose. Moreover
the Defendant relies on Ex. 3
and urges that he leased the
land in question to the Plaintiff
for <u>seven</u> but this contradicts
his

VIII sheet.

any consequent Decree
to inspect and ascertain
is the land really in dispute
before coming to any conclusi
and passing orders. Be this
it may as already observ
there is no evidence before us
the part of the Defendan
to prove that the land
question is an Inam land,
find therefore that the lan
a Mudayem land.

The result is that
shall be passed in aff
the Defendant must g
of the land detailed
schedule to the plaint
Court costs.

Pronounced in open
Bolar 14th August 1884. Sd
C. C. Sivas

Sd "Boles"
Assistant

Sd Ramaswami

Witness: Sd Illegible on the 12th September 1884.

Fee 4-15-0 Stamp for Decree 3-4 Copies for obtaining on the 22nd Sept 1884 Copies 3-4 Stamps for the Decree on the 4th October 1884 O.C. 2-1 Delivered on the 4th October 1884

(General Serial No. 31.)

1888.

OFFICE No. 1725 142 MYSORE 33

From Marketing Commissioner,
Bolarum.

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 5th June
Despatched 6th }
Received

**Enclosures No. 1**

General No. 594 } 1888-9.
No. 169

Adverting to his docket Canji No. 94 of the 3rd April last calling for certain information regarding the Reserved Shandal Service Inam lands of Kayamgutta Kyalam village, Kolar Taluk.—

Adverting to the above he has the honor to append herewith the particulars of the extent and description of the Inam in question.

2. The Circular Canji No. 105 of the 16th ultimo on the subject is also enclosed for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

By Command,

Referee

1886 No 111

Venkatarangiengar

Submitting

other papers regarding

Ramgeeken - Pattee

123/89

ueral Serial No. 29.)

No 1886

From The Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 16th June

Despatched 17th June

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 370 } 1886–87.
No 169.

Sir docket No 263 of the 7th August 1885, forwarding for reference the Shanbhogue's Patte, dated 1st Feb ruary 1843, of the villages transferred from the Jaygir to the Devanhalli Taluk.

I have the honor to return the Patte received with the above

Deputy Commissioner

D.C.

Kolar Dist 1/15 1/3

22/6

OFFICE OF THE
7177
6 - JAN. 87
424
DIWAN OF MYSORE

Kolar District

The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 24th December 1886.

Despatched 28

Received 29

Enclosures No. Two (Files)

General No. 1448 } 1886-87.
No. 586

Yes the issue to No. 24202/169 dt. the 25th Nov
Land, covering sketch of land
land at Kanjeguttahalli
of Kyalasi, Kolar Taluk.

Adverting to the above, I
the honor to forward herewith
the Survey Superintendent's pro
No. 3501 dt. 14th inst. (with
enclosures) informing that
the village of Kodasa brought
under a re-classification survey
and that the Survey Department
has nothing to do with cancel
grant in Kanjeguttahalli vil

which can to be dealt in [illegible]

We would so report to the Board in order that
[illegible] the survey may be made and, when included in the
Kaposvár Canal. —

We beg of Agents to be issued with the Books of
a Record Survey is necessary pursuant thereto —

[illegible]
Deputy Commissioners

LR 11-82-13

111

28

Remarks submitted with Report of Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, relative to the Survey of the Mexican Rancho Laguna Seca, Monterey County, California.

Mr. President:

I submit the following remarks with the report of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, relative to the survey of the Mexican Rancho Laguna Seca, Monterey County, California.

The Rancho Laguna Seca was granted by Governor Alvarado to Rafael Gomez on the 8th day of June, 1840, and contained eight square leagues. The grant was confirmed by the Board of Land Commissioners on the 24th day of March, 1853, and by the District Court on appeal on the 6th day of November, 1854. The survey was approved by the Surveyor General on the 24th day of November, 1858, and contained 35,544.37 acres. The patent issued on the 1st day of December, 1859.

The claim was presented to the Board of Land Commissioners on the 23rd day of November, 1852, and was decided on the 24th day of March, 1853. The appeal was taken to the District Court on the 6th day of April, 1853, and was decided on the 6th day of November, 1854. The survey was approved by the Surveyor General on the 24th day of November, 1858, and contained 35,544.37 acres. The patent issued on the 1st day of December, 1859.

The claim was presented to the Board of Land Commissioners on the 23rd day of November, 1852, and was decided on the 24th day of March, 1853. The appeal was taken to the District Court on the 6th day of April, 1853, and was decided on the 6th day of November, 1854. The survey was approved by the Surveyor General on the 24th day of November, 1858, and contained 35,544.37 acres. The patent issued on the 1st day of December, 1859.

From the Senate

12333

135

Read

191

(General Serial No. 31.)

188

*From*

*To*

*Dated*

*Despatched*

*Received*

**Enclosures No.**

*General No.*
*No.*

1887. 1639

From The Deputy-Commissioner
Kolar District.

To The Chief Secretary
~~Secretary to Chief Commissioner of Mysore,~~
to the Dewan of Mysore
~~Department.~~

(29)

Dated 20
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. 1 plan.

General No. 233
No. 365 } 1887-88.

States that the full recorded extent of the Inam lands of the Thanadar of Kyalmur, Kayamgutta village, Shoulee Hobli, and enquires whether the assessment is to be recovered from the Kayamgutta dar from 1878-79 or from the date of Dewan's final order in the matter.

No 1233/365 114

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,
24 November, 1891.

24

To The Chief Secretary to Government
of Mysore.

Sir,

Adverting to previous correspondence ending with the Revenue Order No. 6744-J of the 20th January last, which directs that the service Inam land of the Shanbag of Kyalanur Kayarguppa village, Malur Taluk, be fully assessed, I have the honor to submit for orders the accompanying report No. 191 of the 14th instant (with enclosures as per details attached thereto) from the Kolar Amildar, who wishes to know whether the assessment should be levied on the lands declared by the Civil Court to be Kayergattaga or on the waste lands which he points out as service Inam.

To be obliging returned.

2. On his taking over charge the Amildar finds that the Kayergattadar admits that the lands declared to him by the Civil Court have been in his enjoyment ever since 1878-79 when he was declared the village Shanbag, but denies his liability

liability to pay any balance or amount thereof, stating that the applicant made land which he proved out of land belonging to the Shanbagi Office, have made loan in his possession, and that if the same cannot be given over to him, he may pay the amount for the same from the sale of the Devasthanam lands under orders quoted above. It having been already decided in the Karanam Department by Government in 1882, that the lands appertaining to the Shanbagi Service are identical with those originally to the Kayangu tenure by the village officers, and that the Officiating Shanbag Karnam had no connection whatever with the same lands resumed by the Kayangu tenure, I am of opinion that the full records being of the Kayangu Rs 3-—-—4, should be levied on the lands mentioned in the court decree, subject to revision at the summary settlement of the same. But as there is doubt from which date the assessment should take effect, I solicit instructions whether the assessment is to be reassessed from the Kayangu tenure from 1878-79, or from the date of the Devasthanam final order in the case.

Under the circumstances stated,

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[illegible]

[illegible]

146

LR 41-82-15

Read. (30)

Again Proceedings

No. 6744-5 of the 20th

191

January 1887, directing

that the Shawbogwee

Indian Lands of Kinnon

Coxpangoosha Village

in the Kolar Talook,

should be fully

assessed.

Also, Kolar Dy.

Comr's Letter No. 1233/365

of the 2nd Nov. 87 [redacted]

to be informed whether

the assessment should

be recovered from 1878-79

or from the date

of the above order, &

stating that the lands

mentioned in the

Munsiff's decree have

been proved to be

the Shawbogwee Inam

Lands.

Order Camp No. 1828-9 dt. 16/1/88

The assessment

should be recovered

from the year 1878-9

in which the Kongoosha

took possession of

the lands referred to

in the Munsiff's decree

as

Scrial No. 81.)

1887.

Enclosures No.

No. 1528-29

108

(31)

Le 41-82-16

No 1982
576

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar district,
dated 17 March 1908.
19

The Chief Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your endorsement No: 820-9, dated the 5th November 1907, I have the honor to solicit instructions as to whether the recorded rent of these lands is to be added to and demanded with the annual Kaipatta amount payable to Government by the Kaivaramdars, or whether the lands alluded to should be caused to be regularly measured, classified and assessed by the Survey Department.

2. The Shanbogue's report No: 205 of the 9th December on the subject is herewith enclosed for reference and return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner.

Reply sent 15/3

Entered 22/3

Intimation to Khasdar in English & Persian Berij 253

OFFICE OF THE 10 MAR 88 GERMAN SERVICES

1888.

From

The Deputy-Commissioner
Kolar district

To

The Chief Secretary to
the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 17th
Despd 19th
Received } March

Enclosures Nos 1

General No 1993 } 1887-88
No 576

Enquires whether the recorded Berij of the resumed Shanbhogi service Inam Lands of the Kyatanur village is to be recovered by the Kayamguttadar.

(General Serial No. 31)

1884.

From

To

Dated 3rd April 1888

Despatched

Received

**Enclosures No.**

~~General No.~~

Canada No. 94

Yukon District

His letter No: 1992/576 dated 17th March 1888

The Dy. Comr. is requested to report the extent and the present Boring of the reserved Skookum service claims lands referred to in the above

"By order"

Draft

Chief Secretary

F.30 122 (General Serial No. 30.)

188 .

34

LR 41-82-19

To The Deputy Commissioner

Dated 7th December 1889

Despatched 16 m

Received

Enclosures No. 2 VP

General No. 6888

No. 271

Dividing Station Surveyed

Many Lands of the Shanbogue

of Kyathanahalli in the Kolar Tk

ordered the reserved

Lines classified

did be included in the

Survey dept but that

for the present the

Records Rents may

be collected.

Reports not available

Read the following papers:-
Letter from the D.C. Kolar dated
9th March 1888 No. 992
5-76
Civil Office No. 94 of 8th April 88
Copy Land Docket of 15th March
1888 No. 500
169

Order thereon.

The Dewan ordered to be pre-
-sumed should be surveyed
classified & assessed by the Asst
D.C.R., but, for the first year
the assessment may i.e. Rs. 3
be collected.

Under Secy.

To the D.C. Kolar with
Sanad Proceedings

124

(General Serial No. 32.)

189

(365)

No. 1203

Name of Petitioner. Ramaswami Kayarabathiran

Village. Kyalanur

Taluk. Erode

District. Erode

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt. 4 August

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

LR 41-82-20

ABSTRACT.

Kayarabathiran claims inam lands in Kyalanur having retained and claimed inam in Erode Taluk. Please note the case to record & return for further orders.

Ramaswami Kayarabathiran alias Ramaswami Kayarabathiran by caste Vellala Occupation Agriculture

35

12

12 Bangalore
8-5-93

No. 1203-

LR (1)-85-21

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,

5 May 1893
8

Endorsement granted to Appajaya, Kayangattadar
of Kyalanur, Kolar Taluk,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 1203 dated 21-8-90
praying for reconsideration of the order passed by Govt
in Proceedings No 6858 dated 3-8-90 regarding the resumption
of certain Service Inam Lands which has been applied
for purposes other than those for which they had been granted

Petitioner is informed that Government are unable to agree to
reopening the case so far as cancelling the resumption
of the Service Inam lands of the land in question

"By Order"

Draft
(Dewan's order)

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

App. F. IX-4

*Previous References*

193 .

( )

File No.

Serial Nos.

*Later References.*

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*Serial Nos.*

**Part B for**

**SUBJECT.**

WD 0578—GPB—22,500—12-9-39